

work in a very different manner from that which it has shown in the present investigation.

EMBEZZLED FUNDS.

In the showing of the disgraceful condition of affairs that has been allowed to exist in the finances of the University of California, made in the report of the expert accountants who went over the books of Mr. W. A. McKowen, the late Secretary, appears an item of considerable interest to the medical profession.

About two or three years ago, the Regents of the University took over the control of the Medical Department, and to a considerable extent conducted its finances; at the same time the standards of the Medical Department were very materially raised, and in consequence the number

of students decidedly lessened. Since then, the Medical Department has had more or less of a struggle to maintain itself on a proper basis.

McKowen succeeded in embezzling nearly \$27,000 in the period between January, 1902, and October, 1903, and for a time it was feared that the Medical Department would be called upon to stand the loss of the funds paid over to the Regents. This loss, however, will not fall, it is believed, on the Medical Department, for the Regents still honor the drafts of the department and have given no notice of intention to do otherwise. If the department had lost the money, it would have been compelled to close its doors. While it is deplorable that the University should be called upon to lose this large sum, it is much better able to bear it than the department would have been, although the University itself is in need of more money.

PROFESSIONAL ETHICS.

In a personal communication recently received by the editor from one of the foremost chemists and pharmacists in the country—a man who may write after his name many degrees, including that of M. D.—occurs the following: "In the good old days the medical profession stood as a unit in condemnation of all secrecy and monopoly in medicine. Today the professional spirit has waned to such a degree that the physician who sees advertised in his medical journal—very likely the official organ of the American Medical Association—such things as ———, ———, or ———, does not stop to ask what place these things have in a scientific *Materia Medica*, but gives the new remedy a trial. It may be that the formula is published; it may be that there is a vague and prevaricating statement of the composition of the remedy; or it may be that a sphynx-like silence is maintained in regard to a matter that so little (?) concerns the physician. So it has come to pass that, largely, the American physician today is prescribing and is content to prescribe secret nostrums in place of remedies of known therapeutic properties. They seem to be quite blind to the obvious fact that many of these remedies are intended for self-prescription—that the literature which accompanies them is addressed really to the patent medicine purchasing public, and not—as pretended—to the "Medical Profession." Thus the principle of secrecy in medicine has been allowed to establish itself in strongholds that were supposed to be occupied by allies of the medical profession. This is the giant evil of Medicine today. The medical journals are all subsidized—willing to share the profits of a business that is opposed to the fundamental principles of professional ethics.

This is only too true—too bitterly true. So far have we departed from all ethical or even decent principles that few of us can without a feeling of deep moral turpitude—of shame—read Article I, Section 8 of the "Principles of Medical Ethics": "It is equally derogatory to professional character for physicians to dispense or promote the use of secret medicines . . . It is highly reprehensible for physicians to give certificates attesting the efficacy of secret medicines, or other substitutes used therapeutically. Probably less than ten per cent. of those who have endorsed the statement of proper ethics just quoted would be unconvicted in the event of its application to them-

selves. And how true is the claim of the writer quoted that men are deliberately led into thus doing wrong by their subsidized medical journals? Of all the advertisements in all the medical journals published in the country, hardly five per cent would not be ruled out by the action of this "Principle of Ethics"! Yet, if it were absolutely lived up to, there is but one pharmaceutical house in the United States that could advertise all of its products. The professional interests of medicine and pharmacy cannot continue for ever in the present ruinous course; eventually they will be forced to fix standards for the unofficial preparations and to see that these standards are maintained. That will necessitate some provision for the protection of the manufacturers who will thus be forced to divulge their formulas in order to conform to professional requirements.

TWO VIEWS OF ADVERTISING.

The regular school of medicine prides itself on its science, its numbers, its organization, its general high standing; and, in the main, this pride is justified. Yet there are certain things which might be altered without having anything save a beneficial effect. Note the views on advertising expressed in two journals, the one an eclectic, the other a "regular": The *Chicago Medical Times* (eclectic) says: "The willingness, on the part of the profession, as a whole, to prescribe the many heterogeneous compounds on the market, has two serious results: first, it encourages the manufacturer in flooding the market with compounds; and, secondly, it prevents the study of the single remedy." The *St. Louis Med. and Surg. Journal* for January prints an editorial to which is set the classic heading, "Let the Galled Jade Wince." The editor of this journal—"regular"—presumably edited by a regular and subscribed to by regulars, most of whom have approved and endorsed the Principles of Ethics of the A. M. A., attacks Dr. Register and those who agree with him for the following expression of editorial opinion: "As a member of the A. M. A., I don't believe that it would be amiss or improper in any sense, or an injustice to anyone, to say that the *Journal of the American Medical Association* should not be the greatest advertising medium for proprietary medicines in this country." In support of this edi-